

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully considered the Examiner's Office Action and has amended the specification to include the required section headings and to avoid reference to specific claim numbers.

Applicant has also amended the claims to meet the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and to avoid the objections raised by the Examiner.

Thus, applicant has replaced claim 1 with two new independent claims 3 and 4 to avoid the alternative language objected to by the Examiner.

Thus, applicant has been guided by the Examiner's suggestion for separating the alternative embodiments. Accordingly, claims 3 and 4 correspond to the two main embodiments that are present in claim 1. These two main embodiments are expressed by the Examiner in the Office Action on page 3, items (a) and (b).

The further embodiment expressed by item (c) in the Office Action on page 3, are defined by claims 5 and 6 which correspond to the piston rod extensions.

Claim 7 replaces the cancelled claim 2, and this claim 7 is dependent on claim 4.

Claim 8 is substantially the same as claim 7 in subject matter, but is dependent on claim 6.

In formulating the new claims 3 to 8, applicant has carefully included all of the subject matter and limitations of the respective claims. Thus, the subject matter of the respective claims 3-8 correspond precisely to the subject matter that is contained in the cancelled claims 1 and 2.

As a result, it is believed that claims 3 to 8 do not read on the prior art, since claims 1 and 2 do not read on the prior art.

The new claims 3 to 8, at the same time, are formulated to define the structural elements in a positive manner, and to provide for the necessary antecedent basis.

It is submitted, therefore, that claims 3 to 8 meet the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and these new claims are patentable over the prior art.

Applicant has carefully studied the references which were cited by the Examiner for being of interest but not applied in the case. After detailed analysis of these references, applicant has concluded that they are entirely unrelated to applicant's invention, and they do not anticipate the novel features of applicant's arrangement.

It is respectfully requested, therefore, that the claims in the application be allowed and the case be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable to amend further the claims and/or specification in formal respects to place the application in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, through a phone call to applicant's representative, and the case be passed to issue.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington D. C. 20231, on 6/7/05

Respectfully submitted,

By: Max Fogiel
Max Fogiel
44 Maple Court
Highland Park, NJ 08904
Phone: (732) 214-8892

c:\documents\fogiel\amendments\honig 773813 amendment 1 6-6-05